REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 15- 21 were presented for examination, and all claims were rejected.

Claims 1-13 and 15-21 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 6, 15 and 21 are independent.

Applicants submit that 1-13 and 15-21 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants traverse all

rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth

below.

NON-STATUTORY OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1, 15 and 21 were provisionally rejected under nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting over claims 1, 15, 18, 22 and 32 of U.S. Patent No. 7,644,434 to Pollutro

("Pollutro 2") in view of US Patent Publication No. 2003/0005118 to Williams ("Williams").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request that the Examiner hold this rejection in

abeyance until allowable subject matter is found in the present application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

I.   Claims 21 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants traverse this rejection and submit that claim 21 as previously amended is directed to

patent eligible subject matter.

Claim 21 is directed to a computer readable storage medium. The Examiner contends

that because the specification describes a "computer readable carrier" that may includes waves,

that the claim is drawn to non-statutory subject matter. First most, the claim does not recite a

computer readable carrier and therefore, the description of such a carrier should not be imported

from the specification into the claim. Furthermore, the claim recites a "storage medium" and not a carrier wave and therefore, the claimed subject matter is not directed to such carrier waves. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 21 is directed to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to with the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 101.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

II.   Claims 1-13 and 15-21 Are Rejected as Unpatentable over Williams and Nguyen

Claims 1-13 and 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0005118 to Williams ("Williams) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,368,889 to Nguyen ("Nguyen"). Claims 1, 6, 15 and 21 are independent. Claims 2-5 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 7-13 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 6. Claims 16-20 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 15. Applicants traverse this rejection and submit that the combination of Williams and Nguyen fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

A. Independent Claim 1 Patentable over Williams and Nguyen

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Claim 1 recites in part:

> modifying a message to be transmitted during a session between a client and a server system to include a session identification flag and a session identifier corresponding to an originator of the session on the server system and allowing the originator of the session to be uniquely identified among originators of sessions on the server system;

transmitting the message between the client and the server system;

checking the transmitted message for the session identification flag; and

reading the session identifier of the transmitted message to determine

the originator of the message.

The combination of Williams and Nguyen fails to disclose at least the above elements of the claimed invention.

The combination of Williams and Nguyen fails to teach or suggest modifying a message to include a session identification flag and a session identifier. The Examiner cites Williams' service token for the session identifier while citing Nguyen for its flag field and reading the flag field. As a threshold matter, Williams does not modify the request to include the session identifier of the service token, Instead, Williams sends the service token along with the request. That is, the message to be transmitted in Williams is not modified to include the session identifier of the service token. Williams merely transmits both the service token and the message together. Thus, Williams fails to teach or suggest modifying the message to include a session identifier as well as a session identification flag.

As Williams does not have a session identification flag, the Examine relies on Nguyen for this feature. Although Nguyen has a flag field, this flag field merely identifies whether or not the communication is encrypted. The flag field in Nguyen does not identify whether or not there is a session identifier in the communication. As Nguyen uses a protocol with a built-in session identifier, Nguyen does not have a need to check a flag field for a session identification flag. As neither Williams nor Nguyen modify the message to be transmitted nor include a session identification flag, then neither Williams nor Nguyen, in any combination, modify a message to include both a session identification flag and a session identifier. Thus, the combination of Williams and Nguyen fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because Williams and Nguyen fails to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-5 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2-5 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

B. Independent Claim 6 Patentable Over Williams and Nguyen

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Claim 6 recites in part:

> appending a session identifier and a security tag to the communication packet, the session identifier uniquely identifying the client in the client/server system; authenticating the session identifier using the security tag; and
> if the appended session identifier is authenticated, determining the originator of the transmitted communication packet based on the appended session identifier.

The combination of Williams and Nguyen fails to teach or suggest at least the above elements of the claimed invention.

The Examiner appears to rely on his arguments from claim 1 for claim 6 although claim 6 had different claim elements. Nevertheless, neither Williams nor Nguyen authenticate the session identifier appended to the packet using the security tag appended to the packet. Williams does not use one item of the message to authenticate another item in the same message. Nowhere in Williams does Williams describe using a data field of the message to authenticate a value of another data filed in the same message. Likewise, Nguyen does not authenticate one

part of the message based on another part of the message. The Examiner cites the encryption flag in Nguyen as a security tag. Even if the encryption flag were a security tag, which it is not, Nguyen does not use the encryption flag to authenticate the session id from the session id field. Instead, Nguyen merely knows to decrypt the encrypted message based on the encryption flag. Nguyen does not also use the encryption flag to authenticate the session id in the same message. Therefore, neither Williams nor Nguyen use a security tag in the message to authenticate the session identifier in the same message. Therefore, the combination of Williams and Nguyen fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because the combination of Williams and Nguyen fails to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 6, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 7-13 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 6. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 7-13 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 6-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

C. Independent Claim 15 Patentable Over Williams and Nguyen

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Claim 15 recites in part:

> a server; and
> a client operationally connected to the server, the client and server being configured to transmit one or more messages there between during a session, each of the messages to be transmitted being modified by one of the client or the server to include a session identification flag and a session identifier, the client and server being further configured such that:
> the modified message is transmitted to the remaining one of the client

and the server;

the session identification flag of the transmitted message is checked by the remaining one of the client and the server to validate the session identifier; and

if the session identifier is validated the session identifier of the transmitted message is read to determine the originator of the transmitted message, the session identifier corresponding to an originator of a session on the server system and allowing the originator of the session to be uniquely identified among originators of sessions on the server system.

The combination of Williams and Nguyen fails to teach or suggest at least the above elements of the claimed invention.

Neither Williams nor Nguyen teach or suggest checking the session identification flag of the transmitted message to validate the session identifier. As described above in connection with the rejection of claim 6, neither Williams nor Nguyen describe using one part of the transmission, such as session identification flag, to authenticate another part of the same transmission, such as the session identifier. Although Williams may describe tokens with an embedded session identifier, Williams does not describe using a flag of a transmitted message to validate the token or session identifier. Likewise, although Nguyen has an encryption flag and session identifier, Nguyen does not use the encryption flag to validate the session identifier. As such, neither Williams nor Nguyen describe the same transmitted message with two parts: a session identifier flag and the session identifier, in which one part, the flag, is used to validate the other part, the session identifier. Therefore, the combination of Williams and Nguyen fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because the combination of Williams and Nguyen fails to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 15, Applicants submit that claim 15 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 16-20 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject

matter of independent claim 15. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 16-20 are also

patentable and in condition for allowance.   Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to

withdraw the rejection of claim 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

D. Independent Claim 21 Patentable Over Williams and Nguyen

    To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations

must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Claim 21 recites:

> modifying a message to be transmitted during a session between the
> client and the server to include a session identification flag and a session identifier, the
> session identifier being assigned corresponding to the originator of the session on the
> server system and allowing the originator of the session to be uniquely identified
> among originators of sessions on the server system;
> re-computing a control portion of the message to reflect the inclusion of
> the session identification flag and the session identifier;
> transmitting the message between the client and the server;
> checking the transmitted message for the session identification flag;
> reading the session identifier of the transmitted message to determine
> the originator of the message;
> removing the session identification flag and the session identifier from
> the transmitted message; and
> re-computing the control portion of the message to reflect the removal of
> the session identification flag and the session identifier.

The combination of Williams and Nguyen fails to teach or suggest at least the above elements of

the claimed invention.

    Neither Williams nor Nguyen teach or suggest re-computing a control portion of the

message to reflect the inclusion or removal of the session identification flag and the session

identifier. First of all, as Williams and Nguyen do not describe having both a session

identification flag and session identifier in the same message (as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 6), Williams and Nguyen cannot have a session identification flag, a session identifier and a control portion in the same message. The Examiner relies on Williams for the control portion feature. The Examiner equates the generating/refreshing of the service token in Williams to a control portion. As the service token comprises the session identifier, then at most the generation or refreshing of the service token in Williams would only be generating/refreshing of the session identifier. This simply would not equate to re-computing a control portion of the message to reflect the inclusion of the session identification flag and the session identifier in the message. As the Examiner relies on Nguyen for other reasons, Nguyen fails to bridge these deficiencies in Williams. Thus, the combination of Williams and Nguyen fails to teach or suggest at least the above elements of the claimed invention

Because the combination of Williams and Nguyen fails to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 21, Applicants submit that claim 21 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' representative would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP

Dated: <u>May 11, 2011</u>   <u>*/Christopher J. McKenna/*</u>
Christopher J. McKenna
Registration No. 53,302
Attorney for Applicant

Foley and Lardner LLP
111 Huntington Ave
Boston, MA 02199
(617) 342-4056 (phone)
(617) 342-4001 (fax)